

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed October 15, 2004. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1, 20 and 33. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Maeshima, et al.* ("Maeshima," U.S. Pat. No. 4,985,760). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to *Maeshima*, that reference relates to a color imager having varying filter aperture sizes to compensate for luminance differences between colors. As disclosed therein,

A color image reading apparatus includes a plurality of line sensors which have different color filters and each of which has a plurality of light receiving elements. One of the plurality of line sensors (for the color blue) has an opening width larger than those of the remaining line sensors. (See Abstract).

In this regard, *Maeshima* teaches adjusting of the various openings in order to change the imaging characteristics of the color image reading apparatus. However, outputs are always provided from the light receiving elements regardless of the size of the openings.

Additionally, *Maeshima* teaches the adjustment of an edge emphasis signal, such as shown in relation to FIG. 22. As set forth therein,

As shown in FIG. 22, there is provided a memory table 321 for receiving as an address signal an output from a rotary switch 320 which sets the subscanning magnification in % and for outputting a corresponding subscanning edge emphasis signal multiplication coefficient. For example, multiplication coefficients for 100% and 800% magnifications are given as 1 and 2, respectively, and plots for the 100% and 800% magnifications are connected by a line to determine the magnification coefficients from 100% to 800%.

In the above embodiment, the R, G, and B sensors are exemplified. However, the same operations can be applied if other color filters are used.

As described above, an insufficient sensitivity can be compensated by increasing the opening area, and therefore, a high-quality video signal having a high S/N ratio can be obtained with a low illuminance. Resolution mismatching caused by an increase in opening area can be prevented by using filters having different frequency characteristics, thereby obtaining a high-quality video signal. (*Maeshima*, col. 8, lines 29-49).

Thus, rotary switch 320 sets the subscanning magnification in % and outputs a corresponding subscanning edge emphasis signal multiplication coefficient. The Office Action, however, seems to indicate that FIG. 22, and the corresponding rotary switch, somehow relates to coupling an output to a first linear array of photosensor elements when a first resolution is employed and to a second linear array of photosensor elements when a second resolution is employed. Clearly, based on the disclosure of *Maeshima* set forth above, the functionality alleged of the switch of FIG. 22 is not taught or reasonably suggested by *Maeshima*.

Referring now to the claims, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite:

1. A multiple resolution sensing apparatus comprising;
a plurality of first photosensor elements coupled together to form a first linear array and having a first length and a first resolution;
a plurality of second photosensor elements coupled together to form a second linear array and having a second length and a second resolution;
a coupler having an output, said coupler coupled to said first linear array and to said second linear array; and
a controller coupled to said coupler and providing a control signal to said coupler ***such that said output is coupled to said first linear array when said first resolution is employed and such that said output is coupled to said second linear array, instead of said first linear array, when said second resolution is employed.***
(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art is deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that *Maeshima* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 1. Therefore Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and that claim 1 be placed in condition for allowance.

Since claims 2 – 19 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability. For example, claim 6 recites:

6. The apparatus of claim 1, wherein said coupler further comprises ***a switch controlled by said controller such that said switch couples said output to said first linear array when said first resolution is employed and such that said switch couples said output to said second linear array when said second resolution is employed.***
(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Maeshima* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least these additional features/limitations. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claim 6 clearly is in condition for allowance. Further, claim 13 recites:

13. The apparatus as in claim 1, further comprising a plurality of third photosensor elements coupled together to form a third linear array and having a third length and a third resolution, ***said third linear array coupled to said coupler and wherein said controller providing a control signal to said coupler such that said output is coupled to said third linear array when said third resolution is employed.***
(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Maeshima* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least these additional features/limitations. Moreover, the Office Action does not appear to address the features/limitations specifically recited in claim 13, because the Office Action was based on the assumption that claims 9 – 17 recited features similar to those recited in claims 1 – 8. However, a detailed analysis of these claims reveals that claims, such as claim 13, recite markedly different features. Since at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 13 are not taught or otherwise disclosed in *Maeshima*, it is respectfully asserted that claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to independent claim 20, that claim has been amended to recite:

20. A method for multiple resolution sensing comprising the steps of:

actuating a first switch residing in a coupler such that a plurality of first photosensor elements in a first linear array detect an image when a first resolution is specified; and

actuating said first switch such that a plurality of second photosensor elements in a second linear array detect said image, instead of using the plurality of first photosensor elements in the first linear array, when a second resolution is specified.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art is deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 20. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that *Maeshima* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 20. Therefore Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn and that claim 20 be placed in condition for allowance.

Since claims 21 – 32 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

With respect to independent claim 20, that claim has been amended to recite:

33. A system for multiple resolution sensing comprising:

means for actuating a first switch such that a plurality of first photosensor elements in a first linear array detect an image when a first resolution is specified; and

means for actuating said first switch such that a plurality of second photosensor elements in a second linear array detect said image, instead of the plurality of first photosensor elements in the first linear array, when a second resolution is specified.

(Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully asserts that the cited art is deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 33. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that *Maeshima* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 33. Therefore

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 33 be withdrawn and that claim 33 be placed in condition for allowance.


Since claims 34 – 36 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants request that the rejection under *Maeshima* be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


David R. Risley
Registration No. 39,345

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on

2/15/05
Stephanie Riley
Signature